

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 23, 2001 LB 536

plant producers on the front end, but we aren't taxing them on the back end. The tax is actually paid by the livestock feeder. Although it appears, I know, to some that it's a tax on the...on the processor, the tax really is going to be paid by the producer. I don't think there's any question about that. If I go to buy gluten feed or steep to spray to my cows...on my cows' hay, I'm going to pay the tax because they're going to charge me for that. They're not going to eat that tax. I know corporate America too well. So we're not going to...we may be "incenting" on the front side, but we're not taxing on the back side. I just am sorry that we have to go through this procedure but I don't...I can't...I can't accept the amendment. I think that you've heard me talk before this morning and then this afternoon again about the use of the...of the tax on the gluten feed and the distillers grain, and I...we've kind of...we've decided this is the way we have to go to make things equal as far as the whole formula is concerned, and I'm going to have to stick with that. So I oppose this amendment and I would hope that you would also.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Dierks. Senator Schrock, on the Bruning amendment.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I passed out a handout that I thought might be helpful to the members of the Legislature. I am neither going to oppose or support this amendment. My heart maybe belongs a little bit with Senator Bruning here. My good judgment says I should probably go with Senator Dierks, for what's that worth. But when it comes to subsidies and support, the motoring public has certainly subsidized the cleaning up of these underground storage tank sites and you see that we have spent \$48 million on that at this time and there's \$271 million to go. That's a lot of money. Certainly this program was started before I was involved in the Natural Resources Committee, before I was even in the Legislature. I would tell you at this time, though, that the money has been concentrated on the sites that have been the most onerous and the sites that have the most potential to pollute, especially as it concerns our groundwater. The interesting thing is, if we'd have had ethanol in all these tanks instead of straight gasoline and MTBE I don't think our